



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/606,326	06/29/2000	David Carmel	6727/OH370	7023

7590
Darby & Darby PC
805 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022

11/30/2004

EXAMINER

SPOONER, LAMONT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2654

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/606,326

Applicant(s)

CARMEL ET AL.

Examiner

Lamont M Spooner

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9-18,21-24,26-31 and 33-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-7, 9-18, 21-24, 26-31 and 33-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/26/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant states, concerning claims 1, 22 and 29, page 10 third paragraph, lines 1-4, "On the other hand, Halstead makes no use of the frequency of the frequency of the morphological patterns of the individual words as an input to his analysis", and page 11 first paragraph, lines 2, 3, "Halstead neither teaches nor suggests that the frequency of the morphological pattern, might be used as a criterion in selection an analysis of the word."

However, Halstead teaches the pattern of the word, the pattern comprising a specification of at least one characteristic of the word, selected from a set of characteristics including a part of speech, prefix, number, gender and person of the word (Fig. 2 items 27, 32 –postfix analysis and prefix analysis, Fig. 8, also C.6.lines 1-67, C.7-C.8.line 6-"the paradigm roughly corresponds to a designation of part of speech. The morpheme also includes a "Next States" section. The "Next States" section specifies the states that may follow the morpheme to the right."-there is a part of speech pattern associated to the word, and C.7.lines 14, 15, C.12.lines 31-33-prefix analysis included in the set, for the linguistic pattern , C.4.lines 14, 15, 19, 20); and

evaluating the pattern of each of analyses so as to determine a relative frequency of occurrence of the pattern of each of the analyses(C.7.C.8.-C.9.line 11-"Each of the paths in the postfix morphological map for each subsection of the input text

Art Unit: 2654

is scored"-which includes the part of speech path and next state analysis, in the scoring step the frequencies are determined in order for the paths to be sorted/ranked); and

selecting from the list one or more of the analyses whose frequency of occurrence is above a predetermined threshold (Fig. 2 item 33- output tokens, C.9.lines 6-11-"the top scoring paths of each morphological map are kept.).

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 15, 27, and 34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1, line 1 "Original" should be - - Currently amended - -. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 9-13, 22, 26, 29, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Halstead, Jr. et al. (US Patent No. 5,963,893 filed Jun. 28, 1996).

Art Unit: 2654

As per **claims 1, 22 and 29**, Halstead, Jr. et al. discloses a method for morphological disambiguation comprising:

receiving an input string (C.6.lines 3-5)

morphologically analyzing the string to generate a list of candidate analyses (C.7.lines 24-29-list of candidate analysis each having word and pattern) of the string, each candidate analysis comprising a respective word and a linguistic pattern of the word (C.6.lines 46-50-morphological analysis-the pattern includes postfixes bounded to stems) the pattern of the word, the pattern comprising a specification of at least one characteristic of the word, selected from a set of characteristics including a part of speech, prefix, number, gender and person of the word (Fig. 2 items 27, 32 –postfix analysis and prefix analysis, Fig. 8, also C.6.lines 1-67, C.7-C.8.line 6-“the paradigm roughly corresponds to a designation of part of speech. The morpheme also includes a “Next States” section. The “Next States” section specifies the states that may follow the morpheme to the right.”-there is a part of speech pattern associated to the word, and C.7.lines 14, 15, C.12.lines 31-33-prefix analysis included in the set, for the linguistic pattern , C.4.lines 14, 15, 19, 20) ; and

evaluating the pattern of each of analyses so as to determine a relative frequency of occurrence of the pattern of each of the analyses(C.7.C.8.-C.9.line 11-“Each of the paths in the postfix morphological map for each subsection of the input text is scored”-which includes the part of speech path and next state analysis, in the scoring step the frequencies are determined in order for the paths to be sorted/ranked); and

Art Unit: 2654

selecting from the list one or more of the analyses whose frequency of occurrence is above a predetermined threshold (Fig. 2 item 33- output tokens, C.9.lines 6-11-"the top scoring paths of each morphological map are kept.).

As per **claim 9**, Halstead, Jr. et al. discloses all of the limitations of claim 1 on which claim 9 depends. Halstead, Jr. et al. further discloses:

determining the relative frequency of occurrence comprises analyzing a corpus of text and finding the frequency of occurrence of the pattern in the corpus (C.10.lines 14-17).

As per **claim 10**, Halstead, Jr. et al. et al. discloses all of the limitations of claim 9 on which claim 10 depends. Halstead, Jr. et al. further discloses:

determining the relative frequency of occurrence comprises storing in a table the frequency of occurrence found in the corpus, and looking up the pattern in the table (C.10.lines 14-17, 30-35-the listings in the templates are interpreted as the table).

As per **claim 11**, Halstead, Jr. et al. discloses all of the limitations of claim 1 on which claim 11 depends. Halstead, Jr. et al. further discloses:

selecting the at least one of the analyses comprises setting the threshold so as to control how many of the analyses from the list are selected (C.9.lines 9, 10).

As per **claim 12**, Halstead, Jr. et al. discloses all of the limitations of claim 1 on which claim 12 depends. Halstead, Jr. et al. further discloses:

selecting the at least one of the analyses comprises selecting the at least one of the analyses based on the pattern thereof, and substantially independently of the

Art Unit: 2654

respective word (C.10.lines 30-35-the entire pattern matching is based upon patterns and independent of the respective word).

As per **claim 13, 26 and 33**, Halstead, Jr. et al. discloses all of the limitations of claim 1 on which claim 13 depends. Halstead, Jr. et al. further discloses:

searching in a corpus of text for a match to the input string using the one or more selected analyses (C.13.lines 45-48- "...may look for particular words..."-indicates searching, "content of text" is interpreted as the corpus, C.13.lines 55-57).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 3, 23, 24, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halstead, Jr. et al.

As per **claims 2, 3, 23, 24, 30, and 31**, Halstead, Jr. et al. discloses all of the limitations of claim 1 on which claims 2 and 3 depend. Halstead, Jr. et al. further discloses:

the approach has applicability to natural languages other than Japanese (C.14.lines 9-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to choose Hebrew, as Semitic language as the input. The motivation for doing so would have been to expand the language selection options for disambiguation.

Art Unit: 2654

7. Claims 5-7, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halstead, Jr. et al. in view of Zamora.

Halstead, Jr. et al. and Zamora are analogous art in that they are both of the morphological analyses field.

As per **claim 5**, Halstead, Jr. et al. discloses all of the limitations of claim 1 on which claim 5 depends. Halstead, Jr. et al. further discloses:

the specification of the at least one characteristic comprises a specification of the characteristics in the set (C.7.lines 14, 15, C.12.lines 31-33, C.4.lines 14, 15, 19, 20).

Halstead, Jr. et al. does not disclose:

the set of characteristics includes gender.

However, as it is well known in the art, Zamora et al. teaches affix portions specify gender. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Halstead, Jr. et al. with Zamora by including gender in the characteristics set. The motivation for doing so would have been to identify all inflectional forms of the morphological analyses, which include all forms of affixes (Halstead, Jr. et al. C.4.lines 16-21).

As per **claim 6**, Halstead, Jr. et al. discloses all of the limitations of claim 5 on which claim 6 depends. Halstead, Jr. et al. further discloses:

when the base word comprises a verb, the linguistic pattern further comprises a designation of a tense and pattern of the verb (C.4.lines 10-15, C.7.lines 23-27).

Halstead, Jr. et al. does not disclose:

Art Unit: 2654

the designation of a conjugational pattern of the verb.

However, as it is well known in the art, Zamora teaches morphological analysis including the conjugational patterns derived from words (C.2.lines 50-55). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Halstead, Jr. et al. with Zamora by including the conjugation pattern of a verb in the linguistic pattern analysis. The motivation for doing so would have been to include the entire array of morphological analyses to the word for stem and postfix or prefix identification (Halstead, Jr. et al. C.4.lines 10-17).

As per **claim 7**, Halstead, Jr. et al. discloses all of the limitations of claim 1 on which claim 7 depends. Halstead, Jr. et al. further discloses:

each of the analyses has a lemma (C.4.lines 11, 12-the lemma is the stem, C.9.lines 12-17) and a paradigm determined by the word and the linguistic pattern thereof (C.7.lines 5-8),

Halstead, Jr. et al. does not disclose:

and wherein evaluating the pattern comprises eliminating one of the analyses from the list if it has the same lemma and paradigm as another of the analyses.

However, as it is well known in the art, Zamora teaches eliminating one of the analyses for the list if it has the same lemma and paradigm as another of the analyses (C.4.lines 68, C.5.lines 1-5). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Halstead, Jr. et al. with Zamora by eliminating one of a duplicate pattern in the analysis . The motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently

Art Unit: 2654

process content indexing or dictionary searching (Halstead, Jr. et al. C.13.lines 54-57, Zamora C.5.lines 4, 5).

As per **claim 14**, Halstead, Jr. et al. discloses all of the limitations of claim 1 on which claim 14 depends. Halstead, Jr. et al. further discloses:

checking for spelling in the input string using the one or more selected analyses (C.1.lines 60-63, C.8.lines 27-31).

Halstead, Jr. et al. does not disclose:

checking for spelling errors in the input string using the one or more selected analyses.

However, as it is well known in the art, Zamora et al. teaches of checking for spelling errors in the input string using one or more of a selected morphological analyses method (C.5.lines 19-24). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Halstead, Jr. et al. with Zamora by checking for spelling errors as part of the analysis. The motivation for doing so would have been to identify the errors in the input string, which would be the directed benefit of having the spelling for morphological analyses of the input string (Halstead, Jr. et al. C.1.lines 60-63).

8. Claims 15-18, 21, 27, 28, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Zamora (US Patent No. 4,862,408 Aug. 29, 1989) in view of Halstead Jr, et al.

Zamora and Halstead, Jr. et al. are analogous art in that they are both of the morphological analyses field.

As per **claims 15, 27 and 34**, Zamora discloses:

Art Unit: 2654

A method for searching a corpus of text made up of words comprising:

morphologically analyzing the words in the corpus to generate (C.2.lines 66-68), for each of at least some of the words (C.5.lines 56-58), a list of candidate analyses, each candidate analysis comprising a respective lemma and a linguistic pattern relating the lemma to the analyzed word (C.3.lines 1-10);

entering the lemmas of the selected analyses in an index of the corpus (C.6.lines 16-20); and

applying a search query to the index (C.6.lines 20-23).

Zamora does not disclose:

the linguistic pattern comprising a specification of at least one characteristic of the word, selected from a set of characteristics including a part of speech, prefix, number, gender and person of the word ; and

evaluating the pattern of each of analyses so as to determine a relative frequency of occurrence of the pattern of each of the analyses; and

selecting from the list for each of the analyzed words at least one of the analyses whose frequency of occurrence is above a predetermined threshold.

However, Halstead teaches, the linguistic comprising a specification of at least one characteristic of the word, selected from a set of characteristics including a part of speech, prefix, number, gender and person of the word (Fig. 2 items 27, 32 –postfix analysis and prefix analysis, Fig. 8, also C.6.lines 1-67, C.7-C.8.line 6–“the paradigm roughly corresponds to a designation of part of speech. The morpheme also includes a “Next States” section. The “Next States” section specifies the states that may follow the

morpheme to the right.”-there is a part of speech pattern associated to the word, and C.7.lines 14, 15, C.12.lines 31-33-prefix analysis included in the set, for the linguistic pattern , C.4.lines 14, 15, 19, 20) ; and

evaluating the pattern of each of analyses so as to determine a relative frequency of occurrence of the pattern of each of the analyses(C.7.C.8.-C.9.line 11- “Each of the paths in the postfix morphological map for each subsection of the input text is scored”-which includes the part of speech path and next state analysis, in the scoring step the frequencies are determined in order for the paths to be sorted/ranked); and selecting from the list for each of the analyzed words at least one of the analyses whose frequency of occurrence is above a predetermined threshold (Fig. 2 item 33- output tokens, C.9.lines 6-11-“the top scoring paths of each morphological map are kept.). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Zamora by incorporating a morphological characteristic linguist pattern and frequency evaluation thereof for token/result selection. The motivation for doing so would have been to sort and obtain only the top scoring paths/patterns which assists morphological disambiguation (C.9.lines 6-11).

As per **claims 16, 28 and 35**, Zamora and Halstead Jr, et al. disclose all of the limitations of claim 15 on which claim 16 depends. Zamora further discloses:

receiving an input text string (Fig. 1 “input word”)

morphologically analyzing (C.4.lines 13-16) and disambiguating (C.4.lines 65-68, C.5.lines 1-5-a disambiguation process), the string to generate one or more search lemmas for the string (C.4.lines 13-16, C.6.lines 20,21-indicates the search lemma); and

comparing the search lemmas to the index (C.6.lines 16-27-the lemmas are compared to the index, for recall and retrieval purposes).

As per **claims 17 and 18**, Zamora and Halstead disclose all of the limitations of claim 15 on which claims 17 and 18 depend. Zamora further discloses:

applying a morphological analysis process to many natural languages (C.2.lines 45-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to choose Hebrew, as Semitic language as the input. The motivation for doing so would have been to expand the language selection options.

As per **claim 21**, Zamora and Halstead, Jr. et al. disclose all of the limitations of claim 15, on which claim 21 depends. Zamora further discloses:

selecting the at least one of the analyses comprises selecting the at least one of the analyses based on the pattern thereof, and substantially independently of the respective word` (C.6.lines 17-20-selection from the paradigm process-interpreted as the pattern, independent of the respective word).

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2654

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M Spooner whose telephone number is 703/305-8661. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Talivaldis Smits can be reached on 703/306-3011. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703/305/9508.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703/305-3900.

lms
11/17/04



PATRICK N. EDOUARD
PRIMARY EXAMINER